

J. LEEMANS & L. JOCQUÉ, *Corpus Christianorum 1953-2003:*  
*Xenium natalicium*, Turnhout, 2003, p. 9-55

Fifty Years of *Corpus Christianorum*  
(1953-2003)

*From Limited Edition Project to Multi-located Scholarly Enterprise*



## 1. Introduction

During the 1940s and 1950s, the foundation was laid for what became an unprecedented expansion and flowering of the field of patristic studies. The reaction against the Neo-scholastic hermeneutical framework, most notable in France with the *nouvelle théologie*, caused a *ressourcement*: a return to the Fathers (including the medieval ones) as sources of theological inspiration. The period following World War II was imbued with a genuine enthusiasm, based on the belief that it was possible to develop a ‘new’ theology which would bring faith and life into conversation with one another. Because their theology had grown out of a dialogue with their social and cultural environment, the Fathers were considered to be excellent guides for such an enterprise. This period also saw the declericalisation and deconfessionalisation of patristics, trends which opened the door for a reading of the Fathers from humanist and historical perspectives. These new perspectives, in turn, encouraged the introduction and greater utilisation of historical-critical and literary methods. The growing feeling for ecumenism also contributed to this renewed interest in the Fathers, as did the realisation that, in this interesting and challenging field, there remained a massive amount of research to be done.

It is no coincidence, then, that many important enterprises in patristic studies were launched in this period. One of the earliest was the series *Sources Chrétiennes*. Founded in the 1940s by Daniélou and De Lubac, this series, now heading towards its 500<sup>th</sup> volume, endeavoured to make the treasures of the patristic and medieval tradition accessible to a wide readership by offering the original text, a French translation and an accessible introduction and explanatory notes.<sup>(1)</sup> Other important projects which started during these seminal

---

(1) The history of *Sources Chrétiennes* is described in E. Fouilloux, *La collection Sources chrétiennes: éditer les Pères de l’Eglise au xx<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1995).

decades were the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*,<sup>(2)</sup> the *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, a thoroughly revised edition of Bauer's *Lexicon* for the New Testament and Early Christian literature, A.-M. La Bonnardière's *Biblia Augustiniana* and the *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire*. Ongoing projects reaching fruition in this period were the *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, finalised by G. W. H. Lampe and Guido Müller's *Lexicon Athanasianum*.<sup>(3)</sup> It was during this period of renaissance in Patristics, that Eligius Dekkers founded the *Corpus Christianorum*.

## 2. A Monk's Dream<sup>(4)</sup>

Dom Eligius Dekkers was a Benedictine monk of the Abbey of Steenbrugge (near Bruges).<sup>(5)</sup> As a monk, his life was centered on the liturgy. His open study-room, his *armarium*, was also an *oratorium*: a place for prayer and meditation. It is no wonder then, that he was

---

(2) For the creation and development of the Dölger-Institut and the RAC, see E. Dassmann, 'Entstehung und Entwicklung des "Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum" und des Franz Dölger-Instituts in Bonn', in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 40 (1997), 5-18 (with references to older literature). See also the documentation brought together by N. M. Borengässer, 'Briefwechsel Theodor Klauser - Jan Hendrik Waszink, 1946-1951. Ein zeitgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Fortführung des RAC nach dem II. Weltkrieg', in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 40 (1997), 18-38.

(3) For a description of these projects, see W. Burghardt, 'Current Patristic Projects', in *Theological Studies*, 11 (1950), 259-274.

(4) For an excellent and much more extensive overview of the first years of the *Corpus Christianorum*, see M. Lamberigts, 'Corpus Christianorum (1947-1955). The Laborious Journey from Dream to Reality', in *Sacris Erudiri*, 38 (1998-1999), 47-73.

(5) For a brief biographical presentation of Eligius Dekkers, see M. Lamberigts, 'In Memoriam Dom Eligius Dekkers (1915-1998)', in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 75 (1999), 251-254. Portraits of Eligius Dekkers as patrologist, liturgist and participant in the Flemish movement are offered in the contributions by Georges Folliet, Silveer de Smet SJ and Romain Vanlandschoot in *Sacris Erudiri*, 38 (1998-1999): an issue which commemorates the life and work of Dom Dekkers. His involvement in the Flemish Movement is also highlighted in R. Vanlandschoot, art. 'Dekkers, Jan', in *Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging* (Tielt: Lannoo, 1998), 888-889.

engaged in the liturgical movement, which was particularly strong at that time in Flanders, or that much of his own research was focussed on the liturgy. Under the influence of Romano Guardini and Odo Casel, whom he styled ‘my revered Master’, Dom Dekkers discovered the rich legacy of the Church Fathers and their importance for liturgical studies. He considered their writings, letters, treatises, sermons, and travel-stories to be ‘sacred sources for the study of the liturgy’.<sup>(6)</sup> Thereafter, though Dekkers was to write many contributions on liturgical studies in general, the Fathers came to serve as his main angle of approach to liturgy.<sup>(7)</sup> This is not to say that his study of the Early Church was focussed solely on the liturgy: from the beginning of his scholarly career Dom Dekkers had been a patrologist and a Church historian. The combination of all these elements shaped his life; his passion for liturgy binding together his life and work as a monk, as a patrologist and as a Church historian.<sup>(8)</sup>

As his bibliography shows,<sup>(9)</sup> Dekkers began his scholarly career in the 1940s with three important publications. First of all he edited *Sacris Erudiri*, a volume of collected studies by Mgr. Callewaert, one of his predecessors as Chair of Liturgy at the Seminary of Bruges and

---

(6) E. Dekkers, *Odo Casel, Heilige bronnen. XII opstellen over liturgie en monnikendom* (Pre-tiosas margeritas, 1), Steenbrugge; Brussels; Amsterdam; Sint-Pietersabdij; Desclée De Brouwer, 1947.

(7) See, for example, his study on Tertullian as a liturgical source: *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis van de liturgie*, *Catholica*, 6/2 (Brussels; Amsterdam: De Kinkhoorn-Desclée De Brouwer, 1947); or his important article on early monasticism and liturgy: ‘Les anciens moines cultivaient-ils la liturgie?’, in A. Mayer, J. Quasten and B. Neunheuser (eds.), *Vom christlichen Mysterium. Gesammelte Arbeiten zum Gedächtnis von Odo Casel OSB* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1951), 97-114.

(8) On Dekkers’ contribution to liturgical studies, see S. De Smet, ‘De liturgie beschouwd vanuit de tuin van de patristiek’, in *Sacris Erudiri*, 38 (1998-1999), 15-35.

(9) A complete bibliography can be found in T.-E. Schockaert, *Bibliografie van Dom Eligius Dekkers OSB, bem aangeboden bij gelegenheid van het verschijnen van de derde editie van de Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, *Instrumenta Theologica*, 15 (Leuven: Bibliotheek van de Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, K.U. Leuven, 1995).

at the Louvain Faculty of Theology. Soon after, he wrote an *Introduction to Liturgy* and a book on Tertullian as a source for the liturgy of the early Church.<sup>(10)</sup> In 1948, when he had already made a name for himself as a specialist in Early Christian liturgy, the first issue of the journal *Sacris Erudiri* was published. In this issue, following all the other scholarly articles and just before the concluding Onomasticon, a contribution appeared, bearing the conspicuous and laconic title: *A Proposed New Edition of Early Christian Texts*.<sup>(11)</sup> The article was signed by ‘The Editors – Établissements Brepols, Turnhout (Antwerp) and Monachi S. Petri, Steenbrugge (Bruges)’, but clearly Dom Dekkers, at that time thirty-three-years-old, had been holding the pen.

In that article Dekkers gave a realistic description of five difficulties inherent to the editions of patristic writings which scholars had had to deal with in the middle of the previous century.<sup>(12)</sup> The first obvious difficulty was judging which text was the best available text-edition for a given work<sup>(13)</sup> or, when only one edition existed, how to judge its value. Given the great divergence in the quality of existing edi-

---

(10) E. Dekkers (ed.), *Sacris Erudiri: fragmenta liturgica collecta a monachis Sancti Petri de Aldenburgo in Steenbrugge ne pereant* (Steenbrugge: Sint-Pietersabdij, 1940); Id., *Inleiding tot de liturgiek* (Brussels; Antwerp: Standaard Uitgeverij, 1942); Id., *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis van de liturgie*, *Catholica*, 6/2 (Brussels; Amsterdam: De Kinkhoorn-Desclée De Brouwer, 1947).

(11) *Sacris Erudiri*, 1 (1948), 405-414. A French translation was published under the title *Pour une nouvelle édition des anciens textes chrétiens* (Steenbrugge; Sint-Pietersabdij: 1948). A slightly different German version appeared as ‘Eine neue Ausgabe Altchristlicher Texte’, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 74 (1949), 159-163.

(12) This is not to suggest that these difficulties have since disappeared, but, today, scholars are in a much better situation with regard to such problems than they were three generations ago.

(13) *A Proposed New Edition*, 405: ‘All who have, at any time, been concerned with patristic studies, will know how difficult it is to find a good critical edition of early Christian texts. In almost all cases there are, in existence today, several editions of these texts, ancient or modern. But of these, which is the best, and on which can we rely? Very often it will not be the most recent.’

tions, and the fact that the quality of text-editions obviously affects research, this was a thorny and crucial issue and all the more since, as the contribution says, ‘the editions of the great Vienna or Berlin collections are not always to be preferred’.<sup>(14)</sup> The second difficulty was even greater: how to obtain these editions? When they had been published in a well-established patristic collection there was no problem; but when this was not the case – and all too often it wasn’t – scholars were completely at a loss. Who but a very few specialists would know that the best editions of several writings of Victorinus of Pettau and Marius Victorinus were published in the *Annual of the Cistercian College of Withering*? How many libraries would have a copy of Dom Germain Morin’s edition of the sermons of Caesarius of Arles, given the fact that it was published by the Abbey of Maredsous and had gone out of print very soon after its publication?<sup>(15)</sup> If one was fortunate enough to work in a library in which all the necessary editions were available, there still remained the annoying problem of retrieving the correct volume from the shelves. An example of this was the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, the volumes of which were numbered in the order in which they were published. The lack of a general index made it very cumbersome to locate the particular volume needed (for example, in 1948 the volumes two, four and six of Ambrosius’ opera omnia had been published, as numbers thirty-two, sixty-two and sixty-four in the *CSEL*). A fourth problem was that, though the two major collections existing in 1948, in other words, the

---

(14) *A Proposed New Edition*, 408. As an example, I quote the judgment passed on the existing editions of the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*, published by P. Geyer in Vol. 29 of the Vienna Corpus (1892). ‘As regards the text, we must give preference to the little edition of W. Heraeus in the *Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte* (Heidelberg); since its third reprinting in 1929, it also includes the Madrid fragments, published in 1909 by Dom De Bruyne, and the quotation cited in the *Liber Glossarium*. Yet to this should now be added the letter of Valerius of Bergidum, “de beatissimae Aetheriae laude”, re-edited by P. Garcia-Villada in *Analecta Bollandiana* [sc. 39 (1910) 393 ss].’

(15) *A Proposed New Edition*, 405-406.

Vienna and the Berlin Corpora,<sup>(16)</sup> were making steady and sure progress, the completion of their respective projects still seemed very distant.<sup>(17)</sup> Moreover, a considerable number of texts, especially conciliar documents, liturgical and hagiographical texts had been edited in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries but had not been reprinted since. As a result, these texts, even if they were not always reliable (for example, Mansi's collection of conciliar documents) were often hard to find.<sup>(18)</sup>

To cope with these problems, Dekkers made a radically new proposal. First of all a start was to be made with the preparation of a *Manuductio ad litteraturam patristicam*, 'which will indicate the best editions extant of all the written documents of Christian Antiquity, as well as those critical studies that supply any necessary emendations'.<sup>(19)</sup> Building on the foundation provided by this 'guide', the next step was 'the issue, with the consent of the publishers and their eventual compensation, of a new collection of all early Christian texts, according to the best existing editions, more or less on the lines laid down by Dom Pitra and the Abbé Migne, now a hundred years ago.'<sup>(20)</sup> Each volume of this 'New Migne' would offer the Latin text, an apparatus of variant readings, a very concise introduction in Latin on the most necessary matters (essential data on the author, authenticity, date, manuscript tradition) and a select bibliography and

---

(16) This is not to forget the *Sources Chrétiennes*, which were, at that time, still expanding and building in reputation.

(17) The article makes this point only for the *CSEL* but it applies equally to the *GCS*, which, in those decades, was suffering from, *inter alia*, a lack of material support – a situation only partly alleviated in the final decade of the century (Cf. C. Markschies, 'Origenes in Berlin und Heidelberg', in *Adamantius*, 8 (2000), 135-145; see pp. 139-140 esp.).

(18) As a particularly telling illustration of all these difficulties, a detailed *status quaestionis* was offered with regard to the edition of the writings of Tertullian (*A Proposed New Edition*, 408-410).

(19) *A Proposed New Edition*, 411.

(20) *A Proposed New Edition*, 411.

indices. Throughout the text, reference would be made to the pagination of the reproduced edition and, in instances where this was not possible, to the edition in the *CSEL*-series or in another widely distributed collection. The *Corpus Christianorum* would contain *every* early Christian text, including dispersed material such as conciliar documents, inscriptions, liturgical texts and the like. Anti-Christian authors would also be included, as would pagan historians who discuss Christian history, such as Procopius and Ammianus Marcellinus. The Corpus would be organised on a chronological, geographical and systematic basis and include all known Christian texts down to the Carolingian period. Later authors would also be included, if their writings contained information shedding light on the period covered by the Corpus. Initially, Dekkers envisaged a *Series Latina* and a *Series Graeca*, while a *Series Orientalis* might follow later. Whenever an ancient Greek translation of a Latin author existed, this would be included in the *Series Latina* and vice versa. Moreover, the *Series Graeca* would also contain a Latin translation or a translation into a modern international language. The best available translation would be selected to that end, 'if possible, one from the version of the text reproduced'.

This, in all its boldness, was Dekkers' dream, or rather, his project. In his daily research he had encountered stumbling blocks and now he was initiating an attempt to remove them. His purpose was a very practical one: to put within reach of every scholar or student a complete series of early Christian texts, as far as possible in modern critical editions. He also expected that many libraries would seize the opportunity to have the complete patristic literature available on their shelves, simply by taking out a subscription to the *Corpus Christianorum*. Efficiency and speed were, therefore, imperative: Dekkers planned to put 120 octavo volumes of 600 pages each on the market within ten years. He also planned to publish only a limited number of copies of each volume, so as to more easily incorporate, within subsequent reprints, improved editions which had been published elsewhere in the interim. In sum: it was not Dekkers' dream to come up

with the definitive critical edition of every single early Christian text but ‘only’ to give scholars a more secure and accessible foundation from which to work. Because Dekkers realised very well that he could not execute this audacious enterprise on his own, he concluded his project proposal with an urgent call for collaboration:

There is no need to point out how much work and equipment such an enterprise demands. It is no less indispensable to know precisely the *desiderata* of the learned public. So we should gladly receive the opinions of specialists and we shall readily consider every suggestion, whether technical or scientific. The initiators of the C.C. will be grateful to all who will in this way facilitate their task and will eagerly welcome any criticism, guidance or advice that anyone might be good enough to send them. ... Hence we beg all those who are interested in this matter to make known to us their objections and their wishes concerning our proposal. We hope, also, to receive criticism, as penetrating as it will be kindly, once the *Manductio ad litteraturam patristicam* has appeared; for it will, so to speak, serve as the detailed working-plan of the *Corpus Christianorum* which we hope to produce. <sup>(21)</sup>

Thus ends the short article which marked the official beginning of the adventure of the *Corpus Christianorum*. Before the project was made public, however, two major obstacles had been negotiated. The first concerned obtaining permission from authors, editors, publishers and series’ committees to re-edit their texts. As the plan was to start with the *Series Latina*, the Scientific Board of the *CSEL*-enterprise, based at the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna, was the major dialogue-partner in this regard. On 3 December, 1947, Dekkers received from the board a response which was, overall, positive. Prof. Dr. Meister, then head of the Kirchenväter-Kommission, wrote Dekkers that they had no objections to the new enterprise and that the *CSEL* did not consider it to be in conflict with its own pro-

---

(21) *A Proposed New Edition*, 414.

ject. On the other hand, the Vienna-enterprise didn't see any reason to change its own plans in view of this new initiative. For Dekkers, however, the most important element in Meister's reply was surely that, in principle at least, permission had been granted for the *Corpus Christianorum* to make use of the *CSEL*-editions. The only conditions were that this be clearly indicated and that further particulars be negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

The second dialogue-partner to convince was Brepols publishers. After a few early, unsuccessful attempts, some common ground was found during a meeting in Turnhout on 14 August, 1947, during which the initial plans became more concrete. Brepols agreed to test the water by issuing a project-description in French and English. If reactions to this initial proposal were favourable, the following step would be the production of the *Manuductio*. If reactions to this book were favourable, then Brepols would consent to become engaged in the enterprise of publishing the *Corpus Christianorum*.

Overall, the reaction in the scientific world to the proposal were positive indeed, though many also expressed their concerns and called for caution. A very encouraging and laudatory reaction came from the American Jesuit J. Burghardt, in an overview of 'Current Patristic Projects' which he wrote for the widely circulated *Theological Studies*.<sup>(22)</sup> The Jesuit J. de Ghellinck, though not concealing his doubts, was also cautiously optimistic and sympathetic towards the enterprise. He made some suggestions and wished the enterprise well.<sup>(23)</sup> Asked for an opinion by Dekkers, Cardinal Mercati, a widely respected scholar in the field of patristic and medieval textual criticism, answered that the *Corpus Christianorum* was certainly very useful but he doubted whether many libraries and scholars would be able to afford to buy it, and was concerned that such an immense work would

---

(22) W. Burghardt, 'Current Patristic Projects', in *Theological Studies*, 11 (1950), 259-274.

(23) J. de Ghellinck, 'Un nouveau Migne en perspective', in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 70 (1948), 512-516.

require the most competent of collaborators and was so ambitious that it might never be finished.<sup>(24)</sup> A more negative voice in the choir of approval and encouragement came from Professor Peterson (Rome), who doubted the usefulness of publishing a text-edition without an accompanying translation, ‘given that scholars these days do not know Latin well enough’<sup>(25)</sup>. One who had been downright negative since 1945 when first consulted by Dekkers, and who had remained so throughout the whole preparation phase, was Paul Peeters SJ, the famous Bollandist. He criticised the project as ‘impossible to realise’ and even ‘dangerous’, because of the technical difficulties and financial risks involved.<sup>(26)</sup> Equally dismissive was the Dutch patrologist, J.H. Waszink. In particular, he had difficulty envisaging the relationship between the *CSEL* and the new *Corpus*. What would be the scientific value of such re-editions? In his view, the time was not yet ripe for harvesting a new Migne. Surely it would be better to focus on editing various as yet unpublished writings which were urgently needed?<sup>(27)</sup> Nevertheless, despite these negative reactions, Dekkers generally received a good deal of encouragement from his peers.

Thus, the first obstacles on the way to the *Corpus Christianorum* were overcome: the *CSEL* did not object and Brepols had, in principle, become engaged in the enterprise. The definitive contract for the *Corpus Christianorum* between Brepols and the Abbey of Steenbrugge was signed on 25 January, 1950 (even before the *Manuductio* was published).<sup>(28)</sup> For Dekkers, it must have been a great relief that most of his colleagues and fellow-patrologists were supporting him, while most

---

(24) Letter from Mercati to Dekkers, 25 June, 1948. Cf. M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 52.

(25) Letter from Dekkers to Brepols, 23 July, 1948, quoted in M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 51.

(26) Letter from Peeters to Dekkers, 26 May, 1945. Cf. M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 52.

(27) J. H. Waszink, ‘Current Topics: A New Migne’, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 3 (1949), 186-187.

of the criticisms about the project were objections he himself must have considered and reconsidered before initiating the project. Moreover, Dekkers had never had any illusions about the ‘definitive character’ of his project. He only wanted to offer scholars a tool with which to work but he fully realised that, within a hundred years, a new series would probably be needed to replace the one he was now about to begin.<sup>(29)</sup> The groundwork thus laid, Dekkers could move on to the next phase of the project: the preparation of the *Manuductio*, an enterprise that would bring its own difficulties.

### 3. Realising the Dream: The *Clavis* and the First Editions

In the 1950s, there were already quite a few good general handbooks on the Early Church, some focusing on the history of Late Antique Christian literature, others presenting a history of doctrine. However, these surveys, though excellent, didn’t pay much attention to the aspect of textual criticism. This was precisely the lacuna Dekkers aimed to fill with his *Manuductio*: it was to be

a ‘nomenclature’ of every ancient Christian text, not only patristic, but also hagiographical, liturgical and judicial, which would point out the best available editions and indicate suggested corrections or emendations proposed in specialised articles and reviews. Furthermore, it could refer to manuscripts as yet unknown to the publishers or not used by them.<sup>(30)</sup>

Besides being a guide for the *CC* enterprise, the *Manuductio* would also serve to legitimise it, because it would demonstrate the progress made by patristic textual criticism since Migne: for approximately

---

(28) About the negotiations between Dekkers and Brepols, see M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 54-55.

(29) Letter from Dekkers to Mercati, 7 July, 1948; see M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 53.

(30) M. Lamberigts, ‘Laborious Journey’, 55-56.

two-thirds of the Christian texts in Latin prior to the Carolingian Renaissance, a better edition was available in the 1950s than the one printed in the *PL*. Moreover, several hundred texts included in the *Manuductio* were not available in the *PL*, partly because of oversight and partly because they hadn't yet been discovered.<sup>(31)</sup> Hence the need for a 'new Migne'.

The preparatory work on the *Manuductio* was done in close co-operation with the *CSEL* in Vienna and in particular with Aemilius Gaar. The correspondence between Dekkers and Gaar runs from the summer of 1948 to the summer of 1951, the time the *Manuductio* went to the publisher.<sup>(32)</sup> Apparently, Dekkers had contacted Gaar because he had learnt of a bibliography in Vienna which might be useful for his work. In fact, Gaar's bibliography was an alphabetical list of all authors and every patristic work in Latin down to the eighth century. The list was presented in eleven columns, containing the following elements: the period from which each document dated; the name of the authors; the title; the edition in *PL*, the edition in *CSEL*; references to other existing editions (where relevant); references to the index of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, to Schanz-Hosius-Krüger<sup>(33)</sup> and Teuffel-Kroll;<sup>(34)</sup> and, finally, references to other related books or articles. In this way, some 2000 fiches had been prepared, one third of which had already been drafted in the described table-form. In the aftermath of the war, publication of this material didn't seem a realistic possibility. In a letter dated 4 July, 1948, Gaar declared his willingness to put this material at Dekkers' disposal, expressing the hope that it might be useful and that, at the very least, his contribution would not go unmentioned in the final publication. On 14 July, Dek-

---

(31) E. Dekkers, 'Le "Nouveau Migne"', in *Scriptorium*, 4 (1950), 274-279; see p. 277.

(32) On the preparation of the *Manuductio* and the collaboration between Dekkers and Gaar, see M. Lamberigts, 'Laborious Journey', 55-62.

(33) M. Schanz, C. Hosius and G. Krüger, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* (Munich, 1905 ss).

(34) W. Teuffel, W. Kroll, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1916, ss).

kers replied in a very positive way, stressing the common features between his enterprise and the one in Vienna. At the same time, he took care to point out that he had prepared more than twice as many fiches than Gaar, and this with regard to a corpus of Latin Christian texts belonging to a shorter time-frame. In this letter, Dekkers also expressed his willingness to explore possibilities for further collaboration. During their ensuing correspondence, it was agreed that Gaar would send the material that was already laid out in table form to Dekkers, and that an effort would be made to present the information on the remaining fiches in the same lay-out. The whole of this material was dispatched from Vienna to Steenbrugge on 1 December, 1948. Gaar's material certainly gave Dekkers a great advantage which furthered the progress of the *Manuductio* considerably. The collaborative spirit of their correspondence continued throughout the following year: their letters reflect a continuously high level of constructive exchange. From December 1949 onwards, however, their degree of contact diminished considerably. In a letter dated 10 October, 1950, Dekkers apologised for his silence to Gaar, assuring him that he had worked relentlessly on their common enterprise and that the work was drawing to its close.<sup>(35)</sup> Indeed, Dekkers had done a great deal of work on the project throughout 1950. He had finished his own compilation of the material to be included; he had evaluated Gaar's material and, where necessary, inserted it into his own. He had also come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to omit some information, because otherwise the *Manuductio* would come to between 700 and 800 octavo-pages. To solve this problem, he decided to drop the references to the *TLL* and to Teuffel and to reduce the tables to an alphabetical list of authors, with a simple reference to the volume number in the Corpus in which their writings would be found. When informed of these changes in early October 1950, Gaar didn't object as such but replied that he would only give his approval after he had

---

(35) 'Entretemps, je n'ai pas perdu de vue notre commun ouvrage, bien au contraire. J'y travaillai sans relâche, et je crois pouvoir Vous assurer enfin: Omnia parata sunt!'

seen a definitive version. He also expressed his dissatisfaction with the title *Manuductio* and suggested, as an alternative title for the work, *Conspectus litterarum patristicarum*.

One can see how a certain tension crept into the Vienna – Steenbrugge relationship when contact resumed between Dekkers and Gaar after this long period of silence, and this tension was only to become worse in the months that followed. On 17 January, Dekkers sent the first galley-proofs of the complete work to Gaar. In a detailed letter accompanying these proofs he informed Gaar about, among other things, the time limitations on the project. Dekkers had succeeded in obtaining a publication grant from the *Universitaire Stichting* but this was subject to the condition that the work be published before 31 March. There was, in other words, no time left to make any changes or even to correct the galley-proofs. Gaar immediately protested against the lack of time to correct the proofs properly. On 5 February, he sent a long reply to Dekkers in which he expressed his own dissatisfaction, as well as that of Dr. Meister of the Kirchenväter-Kommission, with the fact that Dekkers had, by and large, dropped the tables which had been prepared in Vienna. Gaar felt that he had been presented with a *fait accompli*. He insisted, therefore, that the work not be presented as a joint publication but that Dekkers should assume full responsibility for it and that this be made clear on the title page as well as in the foreword. In addition to that, Gaar rather sourly pointed out that Dekkers had never before mentioned the deadline of 31 March and that, on the basis of his initial reading of the proofs, it was most unlikely that the work would be ready in time.

Dekkers responded that he would try to obtain an extension from the *Universitaire Stichting*, since he agreed with Gaar that the time constraints were not acceptable. And he had more news for his Austrian colleague: he had found a *mecenas* willing to support the project. Clearly, Dekkers had felt the irritation in Gaar's letters and he now went out of his way to explain and apologize: apologize, because he hadn't kept his Austrian colleagues well enough informed; and explain, by referring to the unexpectedly heavy workload involved in

the compilation of the *Manuductio*. At the same time, however, he didn't hesitate to gently chide Gaar about the latter's tardiness in evaluating some material (24 pages) that Dekkers had sent him some eighteen months before.

Gaar's reply to Dekkers, dated 1 March, 1951, shows that this had served to dispel the tension between them. He warmly congratulated Dekkers, said repeatedly that Dekkers had produced a magnificent work and added that his own name shouldn't be mentioned on an equal level: a 'praeparante et adiuvante Aemilio Gaar' would be sufficient. He also gave his consent for Dekkers to ask Cardinal Mercati for his patronage of the project, and he agreed to read not only the first but also the second galley-proofs and proposed as a dedication: *Ioanni Cardinali Mercati sacrum*. When, at the end of February, the *Universitaire Stichting* also agreed upon a six-month extension for the publication, almost all impediments to publication were removed. The only remaining bone of contention between Dekkers and Gaar was the title of the work. Following a suggestion of the Bollandist Grosjean, Dekkers adhered to the title *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*. Gaar, however, had philological objections to this title and this became the subject of a lively correspondence between the two from April to June in 1951. In the end, Dekkers stood firm and, eventually, Gaar capitulated.

At the beginning of September 1951, the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* rolled off the press<sup>(36)</sup> as the third yearbook of *Sacris Erudiri*.<sup>(37)</sup> The reaction of the scholarly world was, without exception, laudatory.

---

(36) At that time *Sacris Erudiri* was not yet published by Brepols but by Beyaert (Bruges) and Martinus Nijhoff (The Hague).

(37) *Clavis Patrum Latinorum qua in nouum Corpus Christianorum edendum optimas quasque scriptorum recensione a Tertulliano ad Bedam commode recludit Eligius Dekkers; opera usus qua rem praeparauit et inuit Aemilius Gaar*, *Sacris Erudiri*: jaarboek voor godsdienstwetenschappen, 3 (Steenbrugge: in Abbatia Sancti Petri, 1951).

Outstanding scholars, such as Balthasar Fischer, Almut Mutzenbecher and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, expressed their admiration without reserve.<sup>(38)</sup> Indeed, to everybody in patristic research it was clear that, with this *Clavis*, a new and important tool for the study of the Latin Fathers had been created. The *Clavis* also put the Steenbrugge abbey firmly on the map of patristic scholarly research. The scholarly contacts that arose during the preparation of the *Clavis* and in reaction to its publication, now expanded Dekkers' 'network', and this was to be of great importance for the continuing growth of the enterprise. However important the judgment and the praise of his peers must have been, for Dekkers, the most essential element was that this *Clavis* had now laid a secure foundation on which the *Corpus Christianorum* could be built.

With the completion of the *Clavis*, the next and greatest challenge was to start producing the first editions in the *Series Latina*. All in all, it must be acknowledged that this did not proceed as smoothly as anticipated. The inevitable delays were caused, depending on the case, by the team at Steenbrugge, by Brepols or by individual editors.

Of course, preparations for publishing the first text-editions were already underway prior to the publication of the *Clavis*. In February 1950, Brepols had begun experimenting with the development of a suitable lay-out for the *CC*, at first employing the two-column format used in the 'Old Migne' and later, on the insistence of Dekkers, moving towards the lay-out which the volumes have today. In November of the same year, Dekkers had provided Brepols with a list of scholars who had agreed to collaborate and with a detailed list of works that were to be included in the *CC*. Yet, it would be 1953 before the first

---

(38) B. Fischer, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 77 (1952), 287-289; A. Mutzenbecher, in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 74 (1953), 411-413; W. Schneemelcher, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 64 (1952/53), 338-340.

fascicles rolled of the press. On 16 May, 1951, Brepols were already expressing their impatience in a letter to Dekkers, inquiring when the first manuscript would arrive. On 1 September, Dekkers had to reply that, for the time being, he was wholly preoccupied with the *Clavis* and that he had not yet any manuscripts ready to send. Dekkers also took this opportunity to inform them that a re-estimation of the number of volumes needed for the *Series Latina* had now placed the figure at around 175 volumes instead of the projected 120. In the same letter, however, he could at least report some good news: first of all, that the Spanish Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas was prepared to cover the costs of the edition of the Church Fathers of Spanish origin, on the condition that this support was duly recognized and that a number of free copies were made available to the Consejo. The other good news was that, as a consequence of the publication of the *Clavis* and due the fact that the *CC* was now better known in wider circles, an increasing number of people were interested in participating in the project. In June 1953, Dekkers could send to Brepols a list of fifty-five guaranteed collaborators and seventeen more that had pledged to make a contribution. Most of these scholars were European, though some were affiliated with institutions in the USA. In the end, only some of these seventy-two scholars would fulfil their promise of collaboration, but it was, nonetheless, very encouraging. Of equal importance for the project was the fact that, by June 1953, more than 200 customers had subscribed to the series. To attract an even greater number of subscribers, Brepols and Dekkers continued to work on producing translations of the prospectus in French, English, German, Italian and Spanish. The distribution of this prospectus in so many languages reflects the cosmopolitan approach of the *CC*: right from its inception, the project aimed to reach scholars from all major language groups, something it still endeavours to achieve in 2003. In this prospectus, the aims of the project were briefly presented, announcing some 175 volumes of 600 to 800 octavo-pages, followed by a *Conspectus totius collectionis* which was concluded with an announcement of the inaugural, forthcoming volumes (‘Mox

prodibunt').<sup>(39)</sup> This prospectus was to be distributed together with the first volume of the *CC*, containing numbers one and two of the *Clavis*: Dekkers' own edition of Tertullian's *Ad martyras* and Borleffs' recently reworked critical edition of *Ad nationes*.<sup>(40)</sup>

This was not, however, what Dekkers had originally planned. Initially, he had wanted to start by publishing the excellent edition of *De anima* by J.H. Waszink. Having obtained permission from Meulenhoff, the original publisher, Dekkers hoped to be able to publish *De anima* as the first instalment of the *CC* before the end of 1952 – within a year after the publication of the *Clavis*. He considered it of paramount importance to produce a good result as quickly as possible, in order to increase the subscribers' confidence and to attract new subscribers. Brepols, however, had objected to the plan to start the enterprise by only publishing such a small portion of Tertullian's *Opera Omnia*. Dekkers grew impatient and, as an alternative, came up with the idea of starting the *CC* with the publication of his own edition of *Ad martyras*, together with Borleff's edition of *Ad nationes*. Dekkers got his way and a first instalment, containing these works (together with a brief introduction, a select bibliography and a survey of manuscripts and testimonia) was published early 1953 and distributed along with the prospectus.

The continuation and completion of Tertullian's *Opera Omnia* was also hampered by difficulties and delays. Some of these were due to unexpected causes (such as a long wait for photographs of a manuscript from Leningrad) but it seems that the main cause was Dekkers' ambition to produce, not mere reprints, but editions which, within the bounds of what was realistically possible, would demonstrate some scientific progress in comparison with those already published.

---

(39) It should be added that most of the works on this list announced as '*mox prodibunt*' were published only years later, many of them by editors other than the ones to which the writings in question were originally assigned.

(40) Originally published in Leiden, 1929, it was thoroughly revised by Borleffs for re-publication as part of the *CC*.

In order to assuage Brepols' irritation about the delay in receiving ready-to-print-manuscripts, Dekkers offered, in March 1954, to put at least the first volume on the market, an idea which Brepols rejected because it would double the postal costs. Brepols' main concern was to be able to set, lay-out, correct and print systematically: a wish coinciding with Dekkers' own wish to produce editions which, as far as possible, incorporated recently discovered manuscripts or emendations suggested in the most recent literature.<sup>(41)</sup> All this, along with further delays caused by time-consuming corrections to proofs and the compilation of indices, meant that Tertullian's *Opera Omnia* were only published in the beginning of 1955 as volumes one and two of the *CC*.<sup>(42)</sup> The bulk of this edition, which was well received, consisted of newly edited texts or thoroughly revised earlier editions. For Dekkers, at least, the fact that the *CC* team had been largely able to surpass the standards set by the original plan, certainly made up for the delay and the slow progress.

Fortunately for the project, Dekkers had realised early on that strict adherence to the order given in the *Clavis* would result not only in extremely slow progress overall but also in years where no volumes would appear at all, and would almost certainly make it impossible to come even close to the production rate proposed at the outset of the project. For that reason, he had already decided, at a very early stage, that works should be published if and when the opportunity arose, regardless of their place in the order of the *Clavis*. An early example of this method can be seen in the edition of Caesarius of Arles (*SL* 103-104). Dom Morin had published an edition of this work in 1937 in

---

(41) This happened with regard to the edition of several writings of Tertullian prepared by Borleffs, and was also the case with the text of *Ad Praxean*, for which Dekkers wished to take into account the observations of J. H. Waszink in his review '*Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber. Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxean. The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans* (London: SPCK, 1948)' in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 7 (1953), 246-253.

(42) Though the title page gave the date as 1954, to avoid the impression that 1954 had been a 'lost year'.

Maredsous, but a fire had destroyed most of the stock, to the extent that, ten years later, it was virtually impossible to find a copy. Dekkers acted swiftly and was able to send a ready-to-print text to Brepols as early as 1951. This time, however, Brepols caused a delay, prompting Dekkers to complain that, a full year after the submission of the text, Steenbrugge still hadn't received proofs. The proofs didn't arrive until January 1953, and it was to be a full year after that before the text was finally published.

Another opportunity came in 1954, which was the year in which the 1600<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of Augustine would be celebrated and Dekkers thought one or more volumes of the doctor gratiae in the *CC* would be a suitable way to mark the occasion. A large international conference to be held in Paris in September of that year would also provide an ideal forum in which to present the new volume(s). However, it was not to be: the edition of the *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium* experienced several delays and was not ready until November 1954 and the re-publication of B. Dombart and A. Kalb's edition of *De civitate Dei* did not appear until 1955. The latter was originally published in the Teubner series (1928-1929),<sup>(43)</sup> but the re-edition profited from corrections made subsequently by Kalb<sup>(44)</sup> and also included the text of Augustine's letter to Firmus, containing guidelines for the structure of the work.<sup>(45)</sup> The re-publication was necessary and timely because Teubner's stocks had been destroyed during the war and almost no copies had survived. In 1955, the first volume of Beda Venerabilis, containing the opera homiletica et rhythmica, was also published (*SL* 122), while 1956 saw the publication of Augustine's monumental *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (*SL* 38-40).

---

(43) B. Dombart and A. Kalb (eds.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini episcopi De civitate Dei libri XXII*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 1104-1105, 2 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928-1929).

(44) Cf. *Philologus*, 87 (1932), 477-480.

(45) Cf. C. Lambot, 'Lettre inédite de S. Augustin relative au "De civitate Dei"', in *Revue Bénédictine*, 51 (1939), 109-121.

At that time, the enterprise of the *Corpus Christianorum* was well underway and despite mutual irritations due to delays caused by both parties, a constructive relationship had been built between Brepols and Dekkers. Moreover, in general the first volumes had been very well received by the scholarly community, as Ludwig Bieler's review in *Scriptorium* attests:

Individual volumes differ considerably in their standards of editorship. This is the price that had to be paid if the series was to be completed within a reasonable time. I feel that the price has been worth paying. At the moment when so many standard editions are out of print, when stocks have been largely destroyed by military action, there is a great and urgent demand for good workable texts. This minimum requirement is invariably met and very often surpassed.

At the end of his detailed review of all the separate volumes, Bieler praised the *CC* as 'an enterprise which, together with the Vatican Vulgate and the Beuron Vetus Latina, continues, in these troubled times, the great tradition of Benedictine scholarship'.<sup>(46)</sup> Such a response shows that the first volumes of the *CC* were warmly welcomed and that they were, right from the start, publications exhibiting the sort of rigorous scholarship respected within the world of patristic studies. In short, the problems experienced at the outset of the enterprise had been overcome and a solid basis had been laid for the project's ongoing growth and expansion. All this augured well for the future of the *CC*.

#### 4. Expanding the Dream (1956-1969)

In the years leading up to 1969, when the publication of the fiftieth volume of the *CC* was celebrated, the initial aims of the project had

---

(46) L. Bieler, '*Corpus Christianorum*. Series Latina. Éditions Brepols, Turnhout, 1954-1955', in *Scriptorium*, 10 (1956), 322-324.

been successfully met and surpassed. The *Series Latina* flowered and became established as an important series of text-editions. Moreover, with the beginning of the *Continuatio Mediuentalis*, a new project was launched which would alter the face of the *Corpus Christianorum* and, in terms of the number of volumes published, would ultimately become more important than the *Series Latina*.

Between 1957 and 1968, the *Corpus Christianorum* published thirty-eight volumes in its *Series Latina*. Many of these were re-editions of texts previously published elsewhere. A number of Jerome's exegetical works stand as a case in point: the *Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, the *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* and the *Commentarioli in psalmos* (*SL* 72, 1959); the *Tractatus siue homiliae in psalmos* (*SL* 78, 1958); the *In Hieremiam prophetam libri vi* (*SL* 74, 1961). Other volumes contained re-editions of hagiographical and historical texts, reprinted from the *MGH* (*SL* 117, 1957) or from the *CSEL*. An example of the latter appears in the volume of *Itineraria and other Geographica* (*SL* 175, 1961). In addition to simply reprinting such works from the *CSEL*, various other works which had previously appeared through other publishing houses were also revised by a team of collaborators comprising, among others, J. Fraipont, F. Glorie, M. Adriaen and one of Dekkers' fellow monks from the abbey at Steenbrugge, R. Willems. Dekkers and his team followed this method frequently during this early period. Instead of simply reprinting editions (albeit the best one available in each case) they reviewed each text thoroughly, inserting corrections and checking the text against some of the best manuscripts available or, alternatively, against those manuscripts which had not been used by the former editor. The Tertullian had already been prepared along these lines, but from 1954 to 1971 this would become standard procedure, resulting in the publication of several exegetical works of Augustine (*SL* 33, 36, 38-40), Ambrosius (*SL* 14), Jerome (*SL* 73, 73A, 75, 75A, 76, 76A, 77), Cassiodorus (*SL* 97-98) and Gregory the Great (*SL* 142). All these editions filled lacunae and nobody could, or did, doubt their usefulness. The succinct introduction and the survey of the textual transmission ac-

companying each work were, in themselves, highly valued and provided scholars with documentation which, in the past, had often been inaccessible. Moreover, since these editions incorporated readings from other good manuscripts, the revised text-editions in the *CC* was also derived from a larger material basis, with the result that the text of these editions was, in most cases, more trustworthy than that featured in earlier editions. One should also keep in mind that, in offering such revised editions, the initial purpose and goal of the *CC* had already been surpassed. Thus, in later years, Dekkers did not hesitate to include revised editions or reprinted editions in the *CC* when he saw fit to do so or when the opportunity arose. The most recent example, appearing in 2000, was the re-edition of Ambrosius' *De officiis* according to the Budé-edition by M. Testard (1984-1992). These re-editions and revised editions shaped the *CC* and their publication helped to make Dekkers' dream a tangible reality. The next step, moreover, was already evident. From the early sixties, when the revised edition of the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* was published,<sup>(47)</sup> it was clear to Dekkers that, ultimately, only with new, modern, critical editions could he solidly establish the reputation of the Corpus and offer the level of the sound, text-based scholarship to which the *CC* ultimately aspired. Such new editions would be based on a study of the complete transmission of the text, presenting this material in the introduction as well as the results of the analysis in a reliable text with a detailed critical apparatus. This did not, of course, constitute a completely new direction in the history of the *CC*. Even in the very first years of its existence, such new editions had been prepared: one recalls the works of Eusebius of Vercelli (V. Bulhart; *SL* 9, 1957) and the *Sermones* of Maximus of Turin (A. Mutzenbecher; *SL* 23, 1962). But in those early years, revised editions had been the rule and new

---

(47) The second edition, published in 1961, contained some 180 extra pages and a couple of dozen texts omitted from the first edition were added by inserting a, b, c, and so on in the numbering. Some texts mistakenly attributed to the patristic period were also put between square brackets so as not to disturb the range.

editions the exception. The balance gradually shifted during the sixties and the seventies, when re-editions and revised editions largely disappeared from the *Series Latina*. Thus, the *Series Latina* entered its next phase, with the emphasis now on publishing new, modern, critical editions.

While these developments were taking place and while the Steenbrugge-team, together with various external collaborators, were giving shape and foundation to the *Series Latina*, the indefatigable Eligius Dekkers had already descried another challenge. At the time when he launched the *Corpus Christianorum*, Dekkers chose Tertullian and the Venerable Bede as the chronological limits for the enterprise. Yet he didn't exclude the possibility that later authors could also be included, particularly if their writings threw light on the events of the period in question. <sup>(48)</sup> Barely a decade later, and with the *Series Latina* only just begun, he wanted to turn to the Middle Ages and incorporate the Christian literary heritage of this period into the editorial work. In an article in the 1957 issue of *Sacris Erudiri*, he presented his plans. <sup>(49)</sup>

The problems, Dekkers observed, encountered by a researcher of Christian medieval literature were not the same as those occurring in relation to patristic literature. Hence, the solutions he proposed were also different. In the field of Latin patristic literature, editorial work had made such progress since Migne that, of the 2350 patristic writings dating from the period between Tertullian and Bede, only some 350 were, at the time, not available in a more reliable text-edition than the one printed in the first ninety-six volumes of Migne. In light of this circumstance, the major focus could now be on improving the quality of existing text-editions and on bringing these high-quality editions together in a Corpus. With regard to the medieval Christian literature from the period after Bede, the first difficulty imposing itself is

---

(48) Cf. Dekkers, *A Proposed New Edition*, 413.

(49) Dekkers, 'Pour une nouvelle édition de la littérature latine médiévale,' in *Sacris Erudiri*, 9 (1957), 377-390.

its size: there is so much more material that it simply defied any attempt to bring it all together into one single Corpus. Moreover, while the lion's share of Latin patristic literature had already been edited, this was not the case for these later documents, the bulk of which were unedited. As a result, Dekkers concluded, it made little sense to begin by preparing a '*Clavis Medii Aevi*'.<sup>(50)</sup> For the same reason, it would also be insufficient to simply 'redo' volumes 97 to 217 of the *PL*. For Dekkers, the solution to both problems was clear: on the one hand, the volumes of the *PL* had to be corrected where necessary; on the other, they had to be supplemented by editions of the unpublished works.<sup>(51)</sup>

With regard to the corrections for volumes 97 to 217 of the *PL*, Dekkers wanted to proceed as follows. Brepols had acquired from Migne the remainder of the stock of both the *Patrologia Latina* and the *Patrologia Graeca* and the right to reprint them.<sup>(52)</sup> The very first goal was to guarantee that the volumes containing medieval texts remained available permanently. As soon as there was sufficient interest for a particular volume, a photomechanic reprint of this volume would be published. Moreover, such a volume would contain an extensive *prae-fatio*, which would update it and inform the reader of the actual state of the question (with regard to authorship, dating, and so on). The prefaces would also include an up-to-date bibliography, including ref-

---

(50) Now, fifty years later, such an instrument is being compiled for sources with a French provenance: *Corpus christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis. Clavis scriptorum latinorum medii aevi. Auctores Galliae 735-987*. Thus far, two volumes have appeared: one on Abbon de Saint-Germain - Ermold le Noir (1994) and one on Alcuinus (1999).

(51) 'Si les études de patristique latine ont progressée surtout en profondeur, visant à procurer des textes plus purs et mieux établis, le progrès des études médiévales s'est manifesté en largeur, en étendue (...) Il n'y a donc pas lieu, du moins en ce moment, de refaire les tomes 97-217 de la *Patrologie latine*, mais de les corriger et de les compléter' ('Pour une nouvelle édition', 380).

(52) The revision of the *Series Graeca* was entrusted to the monks of the abbey of Chevetogne. A few instalments of this re-edition have appeared: *In tomos 44, 45, 46 Patrologiae Graecae ad editionem operum Sancti Gregorii Nysseni introductio*, published by Brepols in 1959 (the author of the introduction is not mentioned).

erences to more recent and reliable text-editions. Finally, the preface would also point to other writings of the same author, edited or unedited, which were absent in the volume.<sup>(53)</sup> As a service to the reader, these updates to current scholarship in the preface to each reprinted volume of Migne, would also be published separately. With regard to volumes 97 to 217 of the *PL* as a whole, specific instruments would be compiled, listing additions and corrections to the material in Migne.

By proceeding in this way, Dekkers hoped to ensure that the material in Migne would remain at the disposal of scholars and students, while the updates would make up for its shortcomings. One sees very clearly how Dekkers' scientific concerns went hand-in-hand with his pragmatism and with Brepols' commercial interests. No doubt his very first impulse must have been to proceed with regard to the medieval texts in the same way as he had in relation to the *Series Latina*: in other words, to 'redo Migne' in the sense that they would produce re-editions or revised editions. But there was simply too much ground to cover to make this a realistic possibility. Moreover, one also suspects that Brepols, which had not long been engaged in the enterprise and which had, up to 1957, only published some ten volumes in the *Series Latina*, was not all that eager to dive into a new adventure involving the systematic re-edition or revision of the 'Medieval Migne'. The plans described by Dekkers were thus a compromise between what was scientifically desirable and what was realistically and commercially possible. Ultimately, the team of the *CC* only partially attained their goal: the reprints of Migne, incorporating the extensive preface and lists of additions and corrections, were never published, but Brepols has ensured, to this very day, that the *PL* remains available.

Though the correction of Migne proved unsuccessful, the opposite must be said about Dekkers' plan to supplement the work. Here the

---

(53) 'Pour une nouvelle édition', 381.

intention was to bring together all the texts which had been either omitted by Migne, or were inadequately edited by Migne, or were discovered only after the Migne edition. These rules were, however, applied with common sense. Texts for which a good and accessible edition existed, such as the opera omnia of Anselmus, would not be included. The same held for texts edited in series such as the *Acta Sanctorum* or the *MGH* as well as for texts which were already included in special collections, such as the *Corpus scriptorum de musica*. All in all, Dekkers estimated, forty volumes would suffice for this supplement to Migne, which was to be called *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis* (*CM*). The chronological limits were more difficult to determine: the beginning of the collection was, of course, the death of Bede, but the end was not so easily defined. In particular, Dekkers wanted to go beyond Innocent III, with whose writings the *PL* concluded, but he did not indicate precisely how much further. Nor did Dekkers, in his programmatic essay, unequivocally state that he intended to publish modern critical editions for the *CM*, of a kind which would meet the highest standards (instead of revised editions), but the description he outlined for the editions he proposed certainly gave that impression.<sup>(54)</sup>

Copies of Dekkers' programmatic essay were widely distributed to learned journals, societies and individual scholars. In general, the reactions were positive. Readers were encouraged to respond seriously to the call for ideas, suggestions and criticisms at the end of several review articles. 'The plan is good and shows a realistic sense of what is needed and of what is practicable.'<sup>(55)</sup> 'Seules les abbayes bénédictines sont à même de mener à bien des publications d'aussi longue haleine:

---

(54) 'Nous nous inspirerons avant tout du souci de mettre à la disposition du lecteur des textes sûrs, susceptibles d'être contrôlés au moyen d'un appareil critique, avec référence aux sources. Chaque volume du recueil contiendra également des tables détaillées qui faciliteront les recherches' ('Pour une nouvelle édition', 382).

(55) Review in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 60 (1959), 464.

uno aulso non deficit alter. Quel détachement!’<sup>(56)</sup> ‘Au moment où ils se mettent au travail, les éditeurs souhaitent recevoir les suggestions et critiques de tous les médiévistes intéressées. Souhaitons que chacun les aide de son mieux à réaliser une oeuvre si utile, mais en même temps si lourde.’<sup>(57)</sup> ‘Les grandes lignes, très raisonnables, du projet sont exposées et l’on ne peut que souhaiter de voir la réalisation s’effectuer avec la même rapidité que celle de la première série.’<sup>(58)</sup>

This last wish – that the realisation of the *CM* might happen with the same speed as that of its predecessor – certainly didn’t come true. After the first announcement in 1957, it was only in 1966 that the first volume in the series was published. The reason for the delay is not clear. Were Dekkers and his team too caught up in the many editions that were being prepared for the *Series Latina*? Had the slow progress resulted from the first number in the *CM* being devoted to an edition of Aelred of Rievaulx’ *Opera ascetica* (eventually published in 1971)? Whatever the reason, the *CM* made up for such delays soon after its inception. Having produced one volume in 1966 and one in 1967, the yearly number of published volumes gradually increased. In 1971, fourteen volumes had been published, and these were as diverse as the *Opera ascetica* of Aelred of Rievaulx (A. Hoste & C. Talbot; *CM* 1, 1971), the *Opera theologica* (vols. I and II) of Petrus Abaelardus (E. Buytaert; *CM* 11-12, 1969), the first three books of a canonical collection in five books (M. Fornasari; *CM* 6, 1970), writings by Rupert of Deutz (*De diuinis officiis*, *In euangelium sancti Iohannis* and *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*; H. Haacke; resp. *CM* 7; 9 and 21, 1967-1969-1971) and Paschasius Radbertus’ treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (B. Paulus; *CM* 16, 1969).

The diversity among the writings included in the *CM* stemmed from the fact that no *Clavis* had been prepared beforehand. As the ti-

---

(56) Review by E. Ernout in *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes*, 34 (1960).

(57) Review by F. Masai in *Scriptorium*, 12 (1958), 298.

(58) *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 43 (1959), 187.

tles given above show, the *CM* could and would develop in all directions, making it a collection with little inherent unity. The absence of a *Clavis* also had another consequence: since the volumes were, for the most part, numbered according to the chronological order in which they were published, it is not always easy to find a particular volume. Fortunately, the inclusion of an Onomasticon at the end of the more recent volumes offered a remedy for this problem. These undeniable faults should not detract from the fact that the *CM* has, so far, offered some 200 volumes of excellent editions, comprising an unparalleled variety of texts, which makes it a singularly important resource for medieval studies. One wonders whether a single volume of the *CM* would ever have appeared, had Dekkers made the opposite choice and insisted on first preparing a complete *Clavis Medii Aevi*.

The year 1969 was a landmark in the history of the *Corpus Christianorum*. In that year the *Series Latina* reached its fiftieth volume: an edition of Augustine's *De trinitate* by W. Mountain. On 16 January, 1969, the *CC* and the Abbey of Steenbrugge lavishly celebrated this event. The celebration was attended by some 125 guests: scholars, friends of the *CC* and friends of the abbey. An academic session also took place on this occasion, presided over by Mgr. A. Descamps, Rector of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.<sup>(59)</sup> Anselm Hoste sketched the history of the *Corpus* and stressed that the celebration of the fiftieth volume should only mark a brief break, before continuing the journey well into the twenty-first century.<sup>(60)</sup> The main lectures were delivered by Michele Cardinal Pellegrino (Torino) and Christine Mohrmann (Nijmegen). Pellegrino addressed the question: 'Saint

---

(59) The texts of the lectures during this session have been published in a commemorative volume: *Sessio academica qua die XVI mensis Januarii anni MDCCCCLXVIII Steenbrugis Corpus Christianorum diem festum celebravit voluminis editi quinquagesimi* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971).

(60) A. Hoste, 'Overzicht van de werkzaamheden van en rond het C.C.', in *Sessio academica*, 5-8.

Augustin, a-t-il réalisé l'unité de sa vie?'<sup>(61)</sup> while Mohrmann discussed a more philological topic: 'Tertium genus. Les relations judaïsme, antiquité, christianisme, réfléchées dans la langue des Chrétiens'.<sup>(62)</sup>

In the many occasional speeches during the banquet, there was ample opportunity to put the spotlight on the people at Steenbrugge who were relentlessly working for the *CC*. At the time, the team assisting Dekkers consisted of five full-time scientific collaborators: J. Fraipont, F. Glorie, R. Vander Plaetse, P. Callens and M. Geerard. Besides these five collaborators, Dekkers could also rely on the support of several *confraters*: A. Hoste (his 'right hand'), B. Lambert,<sup>(63)</sup> A. Dumon (the librarian),<sup>(64)</sup> F. Rommel and A. Pil.<sup>(65)</sup> In their turn, the Steenbrugge-team expressed their thanks to the group of (at that time, already) 200 national and international collaborators who had offered assistance or were preparing editions for publication in the *SL* or the *CM*. It is remarkable that the religious affiliations within this group of collaborators were extremely diverse: not only Roman-Catholics, Anglicans and Greek-Orthodox, but also atheists and

---

(61) M. Pellegrino, 'St. Augustin, a-t-il réalisé l'unité de sa vie?', in *Sessio academica*, 25-38. An Italian translation can be found in *Problemi attuali di teologia: puntualizzazione critica e prospettive. Conferenze della facoltà teologica salesiana [Sezione Torinese] 1972-1973*, Biblioteca di scienze religiose, 7 (Zürich: Pass Verlag, 1973), 11-27. The contribution was also included in Id., *Ricerche patristiche (1938-1980)* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1982), 77-93.

(62) C. Mohrmann, 'Tertium genus. Les relations judaïsme, antiquité, christianisme, réfléchées dans la langue des Chrétiens', in *Sessio academica*, 11-22.

(63) His main research project was the *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana*: B. Lambert, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des oeuvres de Saint Jérôme. I.A. Epistolae et B. Conspectus abbreviationum bibliothecarum. II. Opera scripturistica, homiliae tractatus, opuscula. III. Spuria and IV.A. Opuscula necnon excerpta nondum identificata et B. Indices*, Instrumenta Patristica, 4 (Steenbrugge: Sint-Pietersabdij, 1969-1972).

(64) For him and his involvement in the Flemish Movement, see R. Vanlandschoot, art. 'Dumon, Jozef', in *Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging* (Tiel: Lannoo, 1998), 1014.

(65) He was also involved in the Flemish Movement. See G. Leemans, art. 'Pil, Miel', in *Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging*, 2477.

others to whom religion mattered little. The *CC* originated in an abbey and, at the time, quite a few collaborators were monks or members of the clergy, but the circle certainly was not limited to the monastic world. For Dekkers, the only thing that mattered was the scientific quality of the work that was submitted and this reflected in the diversity of the project's collaborators.<sup>(66)</sup>

## 5. Sharing the Dream (1969-1996)

The celebration in 1969 of the fiftieth volume in the *Series Latina* was a celebration of more than two decades of dedicated work. The hard labour had paid off, the enterprise had been fruitful and it had all been worthwhile. The Corpus had become a well-established scientific enterprise that had gained the recognition and respect of the scholarly world, which had now largely abandoned its initial caution. At the same time, however, this culmination of twenty years' work also marked a turning point. From 1969 onwards, the *CM* began to be really successful and the number of volumes that had to be produced at Steenbrugge were increasing exponentially: in 1968 only four volumes rolled off the press at Brepols; in 1969 there were eight and in the following years that number would be almost always exceeded and, in more recent years, even doubled. When one realises that the team-members at Steenbrugge were preparing editions and doing other scholarly work, besides turning manuscripts that had been submitted as books, one can understand that, with the *Series Latina* and the *Continuatio Mediaevalis*, the journal *Sacris Erudiri* and the series *Instrumenta Patristica*, they had reached their 'maximum-capacity'. In

---

(66) This is in contrast to a commentator who wrote that the enterprise of the *CC* has 'einen leichten Hauch von Kerzen und Weihrauch': E. Overgaauw, 'Antiquiert oder aktuell? Moderne Editionen von theologischen lateinischen Werken der Spätantike und des Mittelalters', in *Die Funktion von Editionen in Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft* (Berliner: Beiträge zur Editions-wissenschaft, Band 3, 1998), 205-225; p. 215 esp.

the decades to follow, the *CC* kept growing continuously, but this was, in one way or another, the result of other independent enterprises that were brought under the aegis of the *Corpus Christianorum*. This meant that the fruits of these scholarly projects were published as a separate series or that they were incorporated within an existing series (most notably the *CM*) or, alternatively, attached to the latter as subsidia or supplementary volumes. This development transformed the *CC* from a research institute in an abbey at Steenbrugge into a conglomerate of various enterprises, with centres scattered across Europe, but all united under the flag of the *Corpus Christianorum*. At present the centre at Steenbrugge consists of three full-time members: R. Vander Plaetse (since 1964), R. Demeulenaere (since 1973) and L. Jocqué (since 1984). These days, their role in the *CC* project has become an auxiliary one: the lion's share of their time is devoted to going through submitted manuscripts and making them ready for publication (in the *SL* and the *CM*), though they all also provide research-assistance and contributions to the content when necessary. <sup>(67)</sup>

Before describing this evolution in detail, another development of the last twenty-five years ought to be mentioned. Under the direction of Paul Tombeur, a number of Latin and Greek lexicographical tools have been produced. First published in paper editions and on microfiche, and since 1991 on CD-Rom, these tools have made the *CC* much more accessible. They have also made it possible to address questions pertaining to linguistic and lexicological analysis, which, in the past, have been extremely time-consuming. This not only helps in the preparation of text-critical editions and in the study of an author's

---

(67) The most recent publications by the members of the Steenbrugge-team: J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse (eds.), *Facundi episcopi ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974); R. Demeulenaere (ed.), *Verecundi Iuncensis Commentarii super cantica ecclesiastica; Carmen de satisfactione paenitentiae*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 93 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976); L. Jocqué and L. Milis (eds.), *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis*, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 61 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1984).

vocabulary, but it might also be of great advantage when one is trying to ascertain the authorship of a particular work. Moreover, in the last few years the CD-Roms and electronic tools (soon also to be accessed via the internet) have made it possible to integrate the material of the *CC* into larger units, establishing links with other tools such as dictionaries and texts edited outside the *CC*.

Because he wanted the *CC* to include *every* early Christian text, Dekkers had already explicitly proposed the creation of a *Series Graeca* alongside the *Series Latina* in his programmatic essay of 1948.<sup>(68)</sup> For practical reasons he had decided to start with the *Series Latina* and add the *Graeca* later; the possibility of a series of Oriental texts was even contemplated at that time. Two decades later, the increasing amount of work involved in the *SL* and the *CM* (the latter not having been part of the plan in 1948) seemed to defy any attempt to start up a third series. Then, in 1969, Maurits Geerard joined the *CC* as a collaborator,<sup>(69)</sup> choosing the Greek Fathers as his preferred field of research. He started, *ab ovo*, a new project: the compilation of a *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. In Dekkers' opinion, this *Clavis* would serve as the preliminary tool for the *Series Graeca*, analogous with the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*. After years of intense labour, the first volume of the *Clavis* was published in 1974, treating the authors of the fourth century. It was universally greeted with enthusiasm.<sup>(70)</sup> In 1983 the complete *CPG* was published, with the indexes following in 1987.

However, even before the completion of the first volume of the *CPG*, preparations had already begun for launching a *Series Graeca*. Geerard, Dekkers and Brepols were the initial instigators of the project, which began in the early seventies, but the assistance of Marcel Richard was soon sought for the project. Richard, the famous

---

(68) *A Proposed New Edition*, 412-413.

(69) On Geerard's biography, see J. Noret, 'Maurits Geerard (1919-1999)', in *Sacris Erudiri*, 39 (2000), 429-437.

(70) Some reactions to the first volume have been collected in J. Noret, 'Maurits Geerard', 436-437.

patrologist and editor of texts, would become the project's first Director. His years of experience in researching, cataloguing and microfilming manuscripts<sup>(71)</sup> and the many contacts he had in the scholarly world meant that he was ideally placed to establish the *Series Graeca*. Thanks to him, esteemed scholars such as Cornelius Datema, Françoise Petit, Joseph Munitiz and Karl-Heinz Uthemann (to name only a few) agreed to offer text-editions to be published in the first volumes of the *SG*. Richard himself contributed the first volume of the series: an edition of John of Caesarea, which was published posthumously in 1977.<sup>(72)</sup>

On 25 November, 1972, Maurits Geerard presented the new series to a meeting of the Société Belge d'Etudes Byzantines.<sup>(73)</sup> According to Geerard, the *Clavis* would be the key to the enterprise, the ultimate goal of which was analogous to the *SL*: replacing Migne with a series of reliable text-editions. These could be modern, new critical editions but re-editions were not excluded.<sup>(74)</sup> Under Richard's influence, preference would be given to unedited or incompletely edited texts and to authors whose works had been edited in a very dispersed way.<sup>(75)</sup> Reading the report of Geerard's presentation of the *SG* with the benefit of hindsight, one is tempted to smile, for, since then, the

---

(71) Culminating in his famous *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs*, the third edition of which (revised by J.-M. Olivier) was published as a subsidium to the *CC*. A sympathetic portrait of Richard's activity is given by C. Kannengiesser, 'Fifty Years of Patristics', in *Theological Studies*, 50 (1989), 633-656; see esp. pp. 641-642.

(72) M. Richard (ed.), *Iohannis Caesariensis presbyteri et grammatici Opera quae supersunt, edito Marcello Richard, appendicem suppeditante Michaele Aubineau*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977).

(73) See the report of this conference by E. Voordeckers, in *Byzantion*, 43 (1973), 496-504, with a summary of Geerard's lecture on pp. 500-502.

(74) 'A ces inconvénients [sc. similar to the ones sketched by Dekkers when launching the *SL*] ... la Série Grecque du *Corpus Christianorum* devrait remédier en réunissant les bonnes éditions dispersées d'un même auteur, et en offrant de nouvelles éditions critiques' (E. Voordeckers, conference report, *Byzantion*, 43 (1973), 496-504; see pp. 500-501).

(75) E. Voordeckers, conference report, *Byzantion*, 43 (1973), 496-504; see p. 501.

project has followed a rather different path. Though replacing Migne is still the aim of the *SG*, the editors have always preferred quality above quantity. So far, some fifty volumes have been published, all critical editions of the highest standard, mostly of writings dating from the Byzantine period.

Thus, in the early seventies, the foundations for the *SG* were laid. Soon after, however, Richard became ill. At about the same time, it became clear to Geerard that the team at the Abbey did not have the competence or the material resources (an adequately equipped library in particular) to guarantee the highest scholarly standards for the editions in the *SG*, *a fortiori*, when the assistance of Richard was no longer sure. Though Dekkers would have liked to keep the responsibility for the *SG* within the walls of the abbey, it was decided that it would be better to see whether an academic unit at a university, with the appropriate financial and human resources, would be willing to assume responsibility for the *Series Graeca*. In 1976, Geerard went to the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, to see whether the Centre for *Hellenisme en Kristendom*, that had been established there in 1973,<sup>(76)</sup> would be interested in pursuing the project. His proposal was received with great enthusiasm and the research centre included the *SG* in its program. On 7 July, 1976, a formal agreement was signed between Brepols Publishers, the *Corpus Christianorum*, represented by Dekkers and Geerard, and the centre *Hellenisme en Christendom*, represented by the Professors A. Van Roey and G. Verbeke. Sadly, Marcel Richard, the co-founder and first Director of the enterprise, did not live to see this agreement brought to fruition: he died on 15 June, 1976. He had, nevertheless, been able to write a contribution for the beautiful brochure with which the series was introduced to the scholarly world. Besides Richard's presentation of the series (in French, English and German), the booklet also contained the *editio princeps* by G. Astruc

---

(76) On the origins of this Centre, modelled after the institute *Antike und Christentum* in Bonn, see A. Van Roey, 'Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca (CCSG)', in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 71 (1995), 277-280; esp. pp. 279-280.

Morize of the Pseudo-Chrysostomic *Sermo Phrophylacticus II*. The publication of this brief sermon showed the scholarly world, and far better than any commentary, what the *SG* was aspiring to accomplish. As editors charged with guaranteeing that the highest scholarly quality would be pursued, the brochure named Marcel Richard (+), A. Van Roey (Director), G. Verbeke, E. Dekkers and M. Geerard (secretarius). In 1982 Professor Carl Laga took over the direction of the *SG* from Van Roey and in 1994 he was, in his turn, succeeded by Professor Peter Van Deun.<sup>(77)</sup> Other scholars who have since become engaged in the *SG*, in one way or another, are José Declerck, Constant De Vocht and Jacques Noret. The latter compiled, together with M. Geerard, a *Supplementum* to the *CPG*.<sup>(78)</sup>

Over the following decades, the *SG* became increasingly independent as an enterprise and is nowadays firmly situated within the Louvain Faculty of Arts and its Instituut voor Vroegchristelijke en Byzantijnse Studies, though it still maintains a good working relationship with both the *CC* unit at Steenbrugge and with the *CC* as a whole.

In the case of the *Series Graeca*, the initiative had begun with the *CC* unit at Steenbrugge and then, over time, had gradually become a more independent enterprise. For other similar projects, however, the experience was reversed. From the mid-seventies onwards, the fruits of a number of external research projects were proposed for inclusion within the *CC*. The first completely external research enterprise to be integrated within the *CC* in this way was the edition of the Latin *Opera Omnia* of Raimundus Lullus. Some 250 works by this brilliant theologian, mystic and indefatigable missionary to the Muslim world,

---

(77) For the activities and the output of the *SG*, see the notes by A. Van Roey in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 58 (1982), 201-202 and 71 (1995), 277-280.

(78) *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Supplementum*, cura et studio M. Geerard et J. Noret, adiuvantibus F. Glorie et J. Desmet, Corpus Christianorum (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

have been preserved in Latin (alongside a smaller collection in Catalan). The critical edition of the complete Corpus Lullianum Latinum is the main purpose of the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut, which was founded by F. Stegmüller in 1957 at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität in Freiburg im Breisgau. As a result of the activity of this Institute, five volumes of the *Opera Omnia* were published at Palma de Mallorca in relatively quick succession between 1959 and 1967. <sup>(79)</sup> After an interval in the publication of new volumes, the *Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina* were incorporated into the *CM* in 1978 as a distinctive sub-series. Since then, almost every year a volume has been published and the editors anticipate that, for the time being, they will be able to maintain this pace.

In 1981, another external research project was similarly brought under the aegis of the *CC*, when a fourth major series was added: the *Series Apocryphorum*. The main aim of this series is the publication of the Christian apocryphal writings. Essentially, these include writings which are usually called the apocrypha of the New Testament, but the series also embraces editions of pseudepigraphs and other texts in which the main subject is a character from the Scriptures. The series is edited by members of the Association pour l'Etude de la Littérature Apocryphe (AELAC), an organisation based at the Université de Lausanne (Switzerland) and supported by the Universities of Paris and Geneva. <sup>(80)</sup> In 1981, an agreement was signed with Brepols and the *CC* and, all in all, one can say that the idea of initiating this series has proven to be most felicitous. First of all, it involved texts which, while worthy of inclusion within a Corpus of Early Christian litera-

---

(79) Vol. I (opera 213-239): J. Stöhr (ed.), *Opera messanensia anno 1313 composita* (Palma de Mallorca, 1959); Vol. II (op. 240-250; 251-280): J. Stöhr (ed.), *Opera messanensia; Opera tunicihana annis 1314-1315 composita* (Palma de Mallorca, 1960); Vol. III (op. 118): A. Soria Flores (ed.), *Liber de praedicatione. Dist. I - Dist. IIA (1304)* (Palma de Mallorca, 1961) and *Dist. IIB: Centum sermones* (Palma de Mallorca, 1963); Vol. V (op. 154-155): H. Riedlinger (ed.), *Parisiis anno 1309 composita* (Palma de Mallorca, 1967).

(80) See the yearly 'Bulletin de l'AELAC' (no. 12 in 2002) and the website of the AELAC at <http://www.unil.ch/aelac/>.

ture, did not fit easily in any of the existing series because of their multilingual and intricate transmission. Secondly, the specific character of these texts also made the creation of a separate series preferable. The start of a new subseries, moreover, also made it possible to follow a method of organisation which differed from those used in other existing series. The *SA* arranges its material in ‘dossiers’, providing, in each volume, all the writings which contribute directly or indirectly to our knowledge of an apocryphal text. An extensive introduction and commentary are also incorporated, as well as translations in a modern international language.

While this series had been formally initiated in 1981, the first volume, an edition of the *Acta Iohannis* by É. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli, was published in 1983. Since then, fourteen sturdy volumes have been produced, among them the *Acta Andreae* by J.-M. Prieur (1989), the *Ascensio Isaiæ* by Norelli et alii (1995), the *Acta Philippi* by Bovon and Amsler (1999) and the first volume of the *Apocrypha Hiberniae*, edited by a large multidisciplinary team (2001-2002). Besides the *SA* proper, a series of *Instrumenta* is also being developed. This includes claves to the apocrypha of both the New Testament and the Old Testament, compiled by M. Geerard and J.-C. Van Haelewyck, respectively.<sup>(81)</sup> Recently, a series of concordances was launched with the volume on the *Acta Philippi*.<sup>(82)</sup> Other studies, collections of data and auxiliary research are also intended for inclusion within this series of *Instrumenta* for the *SA*. A journal, *Apocrypha*, now in its thirteenth year, also forms part of the *SA* project. The AELAC makes every effort possible to make this apocryphal literature available to a wider lay readership, by offering (French) translations, introductions and commentaries in the multi-volume ‘Collection de poche *Apocryphes*’, with

---

(81) M. Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, Corpus Christianorum. Series apocryphorum, 1992; J.-C. Haelewyck, *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Corpus Christianorum. Series apocryphorum, 1998).

(82) F. Amsler and A. Frey, *Concordantia Actorum Philippi*, (Turnhout; Brepols, 2002).

a similar presentation also appearing in a volume of the *Pleiade* series.<sup>(83)</sup> Overall, it must be acknowledged that within the space of twenty years, the AELAC has already realised many of the original aims of the project, and the increasing number of scholars attracted to the apocrypha may be taken as a guarantee that this research concentration will continue to flourish. From the point of view of the *CC* this means that a considerable part of the corpus of early Christian literature, which remained, at first, completely outside the scope of the *CC*, is now firmly integrated, an integration which should prove to be beneficial for *SA*, *SL*, *SG* and *CM* alike.

In the eighties, the series of the *CC* became a ready host for several subseries. The first example can be seen in the *Series Graeca*, which hosts the *Corpus Nazianzenum*. The primary goal of this research project, based at the Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium), is the publication of an edition of the Greek text of the *Orationes* of Gregory of Nazianze, followed by the Oriental versions of this text (Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic, Ethiopian, Slavonic). In addition to editing the different version of the *Orationes*, the volume editors also provide detailed indications in the footnotes of where the Oriental text differs from the Greek. Editions of various ancient commentaries on Gregory's writings and their Oriental versions (for example, the Greek text and the Georgian version of Pseudo-Nonnus' Commentaries on four *Orations*), as well as occasional publications<sup>(84)</sup> or volumes of collected studies pertinent to the edition project (*Studia Nazianzenica*) are also included in the *Corpus Nazianzenum*. In 1988, the first volume appeared, and, fifteen years later, the series has reached its sixteenth. No doubt the editions in the *Corpus Nazianzenum* constitute an immense enrichment for the *CC*, and they

---

(83) F. Bovon and P. Geoltrain (comp.), *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 442 (Paris: Gallimard, 1997).

(84) For example, the very first volume: B. Coulie (ed.), *Versiones orientales, repertorium ibericum et studia ad editiones curandas* Corpus Christianorum. Corpus Nazianzenum, 1; Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, 20 (Turnhout; Brepols, 1988).

now form an integral part of the latter: not only do they contribute to our knowledge of the transmission of Gregory's *Orationes* and to the 'definitive' edition of their Greek text, but they also serve as a splendid document which demonstrates the diffusion and assimilation of texts and ideas in the various spheres of the Christian Orient.

At about the same time as the incorporation of the *Corpus Nazianzenum* in the *SG*, the *SL* came to host the *Scriptores Celtigenae*. The purpose of this subseries is to publish a corpus of all the exegetical and homiletical texts of Irish origin or connected to Ireland, dating from the period between 650 and 800 AD. Interest in these texts originated from a seminal essay by B. Bischoff in *Sacris Erudiri* of 1954,<sup>(85)</sup> and was continued during the sixties and the seventies in the work of R. McNally.<sup>(86)</sup> Eventually, these proposals culminated in the agreement between the Irish Biblical Association and the Royal Irish Academy to edit these texts systematically in one collection. In 1987 the *CC* agreed to include the *Scriptores Celtigenae* as a subseries and, to date, four volumes have been published: two in the *Series Latina* and two more in the *Continuatio Mediaevalis*.<sup>(87)</sup> This enterprise is also the flagship of current Hiberno-Latin studies.<sup>(88)</sup>

---

(85) B. Bischoff, 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese des Frühmittelalters,' in *Sacris Erudiri*, 6 (1954), 191-281; revised edition in his *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966), pp. 205-273.

(86) Most notably R.E. McNally and J.F. Kelly (eds.), *Scriptores Hiberniae minores*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 108 B-C (Turnhout: Brepols, 1973-1974).

(87) J. Carracedo Fraga (ed.), *Liber de ortu et obitu patriarcharum*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 108E; *Scriptores Celtigenae*, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996); M. Cahill (ed.), *Expositio euangelii secundum Marcum*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 82; *Scriptores Celtigenae*, 2, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997); G. MacGinty (ed.), *Inter Pauca problemata de enigmatibus ex tomis canonicis nunc prompta sunt praefatio et libri de Pentateucho Moyse*, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 173; *Scriptores Celtigenae*, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000); L.T. Martin (ed.), *Homiliarium Veronense*, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 186; *Scriptores Celtigenae*, 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000).

Other subseries worthy of note here and incorporated within the *Continuatio Medieualis*, are the almost completed *Opera Omnia* of Jan Van Ruusbroec, the Brabantine mystic, and the recently launched edition of the writings of Geert Grote (Gerardus Magnus). There is also the subseries of the *Autographa Medii Aevi*, featuring facsimile-editions of manuscripts, with detailed analyses of the medieval script. Finally, the series *Hagiographies* also forms part of the *CM*. This is a collective work, which aims to present a general history of the narrative hagiographical literature from its origins down to the Council of Trente. Three volumes have been published to date.

## 6. Looking Towards the Future

The nineties were a period of consolidation and stabilisation. Promising subseries such as the *Autographa Medii Aevi* and the *Opera* of Gerardus Magnus were started, but, unlike the decades before, no new major series was launched. This provided some breathing space during which to pose the question: what about the future of the *Corpus Christianorum*? Which direction to follow? What areas should receive primary attention? What would be encouraged, what belongs to our ‘province’ and what doesn’t? There was also the looming issue of what was going to happen when Eligius Dekkers was no longer around. Dekkers himself felt the weight of this last question. During the 1990s, he was gradually realising that due to the physical handicaps of his age he could no longer marshal the energy necessary to direct the *CC* as he had in the past. This forced him to consider how to hand over his legacy to the next generation, a transition he tackled with characteristic purposefulness. During the first years of the 1990s, he

---

(88) A brief, inviting introduction to the difficulties and possibilities of Hiberno-Latin studies today, is offered in M. Herren, ‘The Training of the Hiberno-Latinist’, in J. Petruccione (ed.), *Nova et Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1998).

had already been assisted in the direction of the *CC* by L. De Coninck (K.U. Leuven/KULAK) and L. Van Acker (University of Ghent). The latter, however, had passed away unexpectedly in 1995. With Maurits Sabbe, a Louvain Professor of New Testament Studies, as intermediary, Dekkers managed to persuade Professor Fernand Bossier to become his successor. Bossier, thanks to his contributions to, *inter alia*, the *Aristoteles Latinus*, was a skilled philologist and specialist in the critical edition of Medieval Latin texts, and had retired from his academic positions in Antwerp and Leuven. He agreed to become involved in the *Corpus Christianorum* and took up his commission for a period of five years in 1997 (renewed in 2002). Bossier knew that scientific research on such a scale could only be achieved through team-work: he formed a Scientific Committee, composed of academics from all the Flemish Universities, and named Paul Tombeur (UCL) as the director of the Cetedoc arm of the project.<sup>(89)</sup> From 1998 onwards, this organisation worked smoothly and when Dekkers passed away on 15 December, 1998, he knew he had not only founded and developed an important and internationally recognised scholarly enterprise, but that it had also been passed on successfully to future generations.

In recent years, the Scientific Committee has largely maintained Dekkers' original direction in the ongoing development of the *CC*, meaning that it is and will remain, in the first instance, a philological enterprise, aimed at making the treasures of the Christian Late Antique and Medieval past more accessible.<sup>(90)</sup> This is also reflected in

---

(89) Today, the members of the Scientific Committee are R. Beyers, G. Declercq, L. De Coninck, J. Goossens, M. Lamberigts, P. Tombeur, M. Van Uytfganghe, P. Verdeyen and A. Derolez.

(90) Of course this does not preclude that monographs primarily dealing with the content of texts are published as well, as has been done in some recent volumes of *Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* (IPM): J. Borsje, *From Chaos to Enemy: Encounters with Monsters in Early Irish Texts: an Investigation Related to the Process of Christianization and the Concept of Evil* (IP, 29), 1996; M. Conti, *The Life and Works of Potamius of Lisbon. A Biographical and Literary Study with English Translation and a Complete Commentary on the Extant*

the new subtitle of *Sacris Erudiri*, which was changed from ‘Jaarboek voor godsdienstwetenschappen’ into ‘A Journal on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity’. In the text-editions it offers, the *CC* will continue to aim at the highest standards, ensuring that each edition, as well as offering a reliable text, will also document its transmission. The creation and compilation of various electronic tools, which integrate material from the *CC* and also enrich this with material external to the collection, will also continue under direction of Paul Tombeur. Furthermore, the *CC* is pleased to continue the various existing series and subseries, as administered in Steenbrugge and elsewhere. It will keep offering publication possibilities in *Sacris Erudiri* and *Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* without restriction as to the topic. New offerings for publication projects, individual editions or even proposals for a possible subseries within an existing series, will be welcomed with enthusiasm and reviewed critically.

In addition to continuing the existing projects and with the prospect of incorporating new ones, the question should also be asked as to whether there are any new challenges yet to be addressed by a collective enterprise like the *Corpus Christianorum*. I mention two examples which are linked to the early history of the enterprise but which, so far, have failed to be realized. The first concerns translations. Though this was explicitly proposed by Dekkers when he initiated the project,<sup>(91)</sup> only in a few rare cases has the *Corpus* published texts accompanied by a translation in a modern language on the facing page.<sup>(92)</sup> In view of the diminishing knowledge of classical lan-

---

*Works* (IP, 32), 1998; T. O’Loughlin, *Teachers and Code-breakers: the Latin Genesis Tradition, 430-800* (IP, 35), 1998; L.H. Westra, *The Apostles’ Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries* (IPM 43), 2002.

(91) See *A Proposed New Edition*, 412-413.

(92) Such exceptions are *SL* 69A (Potamius), 113 (Isidorus), 133-133A (Aenigmata), the *Opera Omnia* of Ruusbroec (original Middledutch accompanied by the Latin translation of Surius (1552) and a translation in modern English) as well as some volumes in the *Series Graeca* (e.g. vols. 29, 32 and 35, containing the *Tractatus contra Damianum* of Petrus Callinicus).

guages, it might be worthwhile to reconsider this policy as adopted in practice thus far. Indeed, the point could be made that including translations in the *CC* is perfectly in line with its basic mission, i.e. fostering the study of the Church Fathers.

A second interesting focus could be that of ancient *versiones*. Dom Dekkers has already pointed to this field of study in an article in one of the first issues of *Sacris Erudiri*.<sup>(93)</sup> Some of the volumes published within the *CC* offer important material in this regard. The *Series Graeca*, in particular, comes to mind here, because this series is often not only presenting the Greek original but also its ancient and medieval translations. Besides the volumes of the subseries of the *Corpus Nazianzenum*, which presents the Oriental versions of Gregory's works, one can also refer, in this regard, to several volumes devoted to the works of Maximus the Confessor. In the edition of his *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (*SG* 7 and 22) the Greek text is accompanied by the Latin translation of John Scotus Eriugena. The *Series Graeca* also includes the Latin translation of the *Ambigua ad Ioannem* (*SG* 18), the Latin translation by Anastasius Bibliothecarius which illustrates the life of Maximus (*SG* 39), and two Latin translations of the *Liber Asceticus* (*SG* 40). These are but a few examples of materials within the *Corpus Christianorum* which show the vital importance of studying the transmission of texts and ideas between East and West. Continuing and increasing these efforts to offer bilingual editions—if possible, in collaboration with other enterprises engaged in the preparation of text-editions—can not only foster the study of their transmission but might also encourage the study of the process of translation and of the distribution of texts in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

I would like to end this survey covering fifty years of *Corpus Christianorum*, in the same way that Eligius Dekkers ended his programmatic essays on the *Series Latina* and the *Continuatio Mediaevalis*: with a call for cooperation. Over the past five decades, the *Corpus Christia-*

---

(93) E. Dekkers, 'Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins', in *Sacris Erudiri*, 5 (1953), 193-233.

*norm* developed into what it is now, thanks to hundreds of collaborators from all over the world. They offered the results of their scholarly endeavours for inclusion in the series of the *Corpus* and thus drove it forward. They have always presented us with new ideas and projects. They deserve thanks for their trust and collaboration. Looking towards the future, I wish to express the hope that this dynamic collaborative effort may be continued and strengthened. The Scientific Committee and all scholars attached to the *CC* will do their utmost best and invest all their expertise to ensure the flourishing of the *CC*. In the end, though, it all depends on the collaboration of the international scholarly community. Without this, the *CC* would again become what it initially was: a group scholars working in an abbey on text-editions of the Fathers. All, therefore, are warmly invited to come forward with their various contributions to the basic mission of the *Corpus Christianorum* and of patristic and medieval scholarship in general: editing the Fathers, understanding the Fathers, learning from the Fathers but, above all, enjoying the Fathers.

Johan Leemans

Postdoctoral Fellow of the FSR-F  
Faculty of Theology  
K.U. Leuven